

U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

166449



POLLUTION REPORT

DATE: August 18, 1989

Region II
Response and Prevention Branch
Edison, New Jersey 08837

TO: S. Luftig, EPA
R. Salkie, EPA
D. Karlin, EPA
M. Randol, EPA
G. Pavlou, EPA
G. Zachos, EPA
J. Trela, NJDEP
L. Grayson, NJDEP
D. Beeman, NJDEP
A. Zach, Newark Eng.
ERD, Washington
(E-Mail)
TAT

(201) 548-8730 - Commercial and FTS
24 Hour Emergency

POLREP NO.: One (1)
INCIDENT NAME: Tidewater Baling
SITE NO.: 4N
POLLUTANT: PCB and Heavy Metal Contaminated Runoff
CLASSIFICATION: Major
SOURCE: Scrap Metal Baling Facility
LOCATION: Newark, Essex County, New Jersey
AMOUNT: N/A
WATER BODY: Passaic River

1. SITUATION:

A. The Ironbound Recreational Center (IRC) is referred to as the Tidewater Baling site due to its proximity to the Tidewater Baling Corporation (TBC), a scrap metal baling facility adjacent to the IRC in the Ironbound section of Newark. Ironbound is an urban industrial neighborhood inhabited by several thousand people.

B. Uncontrolled runoff from the TBC flows along a Conrail spur and discharges into a low-lying marsh area near the scoreboard at the northern end of IRC's property. This area often overflows and enters a storm sewer (identified by the Newark Department of Engineering as a possible dry well) on the IRC property. Sampling by NJDEP and EPA has confirmed the scoreboard area is contaminated with PCBs and heavy metals which can be linked to the TBC and possibly Conrail.

C. In response to a NJDEP directive to the TBC to remedy the facility's drainage problems, the owner has constructed several unlined pits to collect rainwater and placed sorbent pads along the flow path of the runoff.

D. Fencing and warning signs installed by the NJDEP and the City of Newark to isolate the scoreboard area have been breeched and the latter have been removed.

E. The recreation center, built in 1968, is situated on property formerly owned by the Celanese Corporation. Celanese donated the land to the City of Newark to be developed for recreational use. It is suspected that many of the materials from the former facility, including hazardous chemicals, were buried on-site. Evidence was found when the city unearthed buried drums during excavation for a swimming pool in the southeast corner of the site.

2. ACTION TAKEN:

A. The scoreboard area was referred to EPA for CERCLA Removal Action on February 2, 1989 to restrict access and lessen the threat of contact with the contaminated soil.

B. On May 18, 1989, members of EPA and the Technical Assistance Team (TAT) performed a preliminary site assessment. The TBC facility as well as the marsh area and the IRC were inspected. TBC's poor housekeeping practices were confirmed by the widespread evidence of oil-contaminated soil. During the assessment, ten soil, two aqueous, and three oil samples were collected from randomly chosen locations on TBC's and IRC's properties. One of the oil samples was taken directly from TBC's hydraulic baler, and another sample from an abandoned rail car on TBC's property. This rail car was found to contain a 5 inch layer of oil on top of an aqueous layer. The third oil sample was taken from a storm sewer located on the recreation center's property. Runoff from the TBC facility is believed to enter this collection point during heavy rainfall.

C. Analytical results received on May 22, 1989 of samples collected during the site assessment revealed significant soil contamination of varying degrees throughout the site. The presence of PCBs (specifically, Aroclor 1248 and 1254) and heavy metals (such as arsenic, cadmium, chromium, and lead) were detected in the samples. Analysis of the two aqueous samples did not disclose any major contamination, but the oil collected from the baler and abandoned rail car was found to have elevated levels of Aroclor as well as cadmium, chromium, and lead. Analysis of the oil from the storm sewer did not reveal any contamination, so it is assumed that this oil originated from the recreation center itself and not via runoff from TBC.

D. An Expedited Action Memorandum requesting \$100,000, of which \$50,000 was for mitigation contracting, was signed on July 20, 1989.

E. On July 28, 1989, EPA, TAT, and ERCS met on-site to discuss the proposed site work. This work will include construction of a 6 foot high fence around the exclusion zone, complete with barbed wire and a gate. All trees and brush located on the fence line will be removed. ERCS will also remove the top layer of soil along the southern fence line and use the soil to build a small earthen dam on the western side of the site. This dam will prevent runoff from migrating to nearby playing fields. Any soil removed from the fence line will be replaced with clean soil or sand.

F. TAT returned to the IRC on August 1, 1989 to obtain accurate site measurements that were used to solicit bids for the fence construction. TAT also measured the sections of fence presently on-site that will be repaired by the ERCS subcontractor.

G. TAT prepared Site Safety and Community Relations Plans as directed by the EPA OSC.

H. ERCS mobilized to the site on August 16, 1989 to clear the trees and brush from the perimeter of the exclusion zone. The three-man ERCS crew used a chain saw and a "weed wacker" to perform the work. A backhoe was also mobilized to level the soil along the southern edge of the exclusion zone. After the brush was cleared, the backhoe scraped a few inches of soil from the fence line. This soil was used to construct the earthen dam on the site's western border. The soil used to build the dam was replaced with clean sand which was stockpiled at the southern end of IRC's property. EPA obtained permission from the Newark Department of Engineering to use this sand for site activities. TAT photodocumented all work performed on-site.

Five fence contractors were also present to survey the site and to prepare bids for the fence construction.

3. FUTURE PLANS AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

A. The fence contractor will mobilize to erect a new fence and repair the existing fence around the exclusion zone as specified by EPA.

B. ERCS will place warning signs in three languages behind the fence in the exclusion zone.

4. FINANCIAL STATUS:

A. Total Project Ceiling Authorized as of 8/18/89	\$100,000
B. Total Funds Authorized for Mitigation Contracting as of 8/18/89	\$ 50,000
C. Expenditures for Mitigation Contracts	
1.a. Total amount obligated (DCN# KE 3037) as of 8/18/89	\$ 50,000
1.b. Estimated Expenditures as of 8/18/89	\$ 4,955
1.c. Balance Remaining	\$ 45,045
D. Unobligated Balance Remaining	\$ 0
E. Estimate of Total Expenditures to Date for all Mitigation Contracts	\$ 4,955
F. Other Extramural Costs	
1.a. TAT Salary/Travel as of 8/18/89	\$ 5,332
G. Intramural Removal Costs	
1.a. EPA Salary/Travel as of 8/18/89	\$ 2,450
H. Total Expenditures	\$ 12,737
I. Percentage of Total Project Ceiling	12.7%

FURTHER
POLREPS
FINAL POLREP _____ FORTHCOMING X SUBMITTED BY Eugene Dominach
Eugene Dominach, OSC
Removal Action Branch

DATE OF RELEASE: August 29, 1989